

Any additional fee required has been calculated as follows:

	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid	Number Extra Claims Present	Rate	Additional Fee
Total	10	- 20* =		x	
Independent	3	- 3** =		x	
First presentation of Multiple Dependent Claim(s) (if applicable)					
TOTAL					0.00

*not less than 20

** not less than 3

No additional fee is required.

In the event a fee is required or if any additional fee during the prosecution of this application is not paid, the Patent Office is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

CONTINGENT EXTENSION REQUEST

If this communication is filed after the shortened statutory time period had elapsed and no separate Petition is enclosed, the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is petitioned, under 37 CFR 1.136(a), to extend the time for filing a response to the outstanding Office Action by the number of months which will avoid abandonment under 37 CFR 1.135. The fee under 37 CFR 1.17 should be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. In light of the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action asserts that the specification does not describe “wherein the base station does not broadcast the authentication request information.” We respectfully disagree with this assertion.

According to the present invention, there is no need for the base station to broadcast the authentication request information, and there is no description that the base station broadcasts the authentication request information. Therefore, in the present invention, the base station does not broadcast the authentication request information.

The pending claims recite a LAN system for causing a base station that is inside a LAN to determine whether or not to authenticate a terminal station outside of said LAN wherein the base station does not broadcast the authentication request information. As explicitly recited in the specification, with reference to Figure 7, wireless base station 11 asks an inner LAN authenticating server to authenticate wireless terminal 22. This authentication is performed without an authentication request issued from the base station. The specification describes an embodiment wherein authentication takes place without the base station broadcasting the authentication request information. As such, claiming that the authentication request information need not be broadcast by the base station is fully supported by the specification.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,819,178 ("Cropper"). We respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under § 102(b), Cropper is related to a cellular phone network, and therefore it is necessary for Cropper's invention to broadcast the authentication request under the standard of roaming. In contrast, according to the present invention, broadcasting an authentication request is not carried out. Therefore, the present invention is unlike the system disclosed in Cropper.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,873,609 ("Jones") in view of Software Architecture for Next Generation Routers ("DeCasper"). Finally, claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cropper in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,397,056 ("Bugnon"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

The assertion that the authentication request information of claim 1 corresponds to the new user of Jones, and the reception packet of claim 1 corresponds to the new user of Jones is incorrect. In addition, RADIUS, which is regarded as corresponding to the authentication managing portion of claim 1, performs authentication for accessing the access Network operator registration server 36, and does not perform authentication for using the managed IP network.

Further, the assertion that "transferring the packet received from the interface portion to the LAN" of claim 1 corresponds to "transferring the packet to the managed IP network" is also incorrect. This assertion is incorrect, because the access operator RADIUS authentication server 34 does not transfer packet to the managed IP network to anywhere.

Further, the assertion that "transmitting to the packet received from the interface portion to the predetermined server or network-connected device" of claim 1 corresponds to "transmitting the packet to the Access Operators registration server 36" is incorrect. This assertion is wrong because the packet is transferred between the server 36 and the PC 22 not via the server 34. Those skilled in the art would not find the two destinations of the packet received by the server (server 34) of claim 1 in Jones.

Claims 3 and 4 depend either directly or indirectly from, and contain all the limitations of claim 1. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Cropper and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 3 and 4 should also be allowed.

Regarding the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under § 103(a), similarly to claims 1, 2, 5 and 6, the invention of Cropper is related to a cellular phone network, and therefore it is necessary for Cropper's invention to broadcast the authentication request under the standard of roaming. On the other hand, according to the present invention, broadcasting an authentication request is not carried out. Therefore, the present invention is different from the Cropper's invention.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: February 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By
Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs